

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 2, 4, 23, 29, 33, and 35 are currently amended.

5

Support for amendments to independent claims 23 and 29 can be found at least on page 33, line 18 to page 34, line 23, FIGs. 9A-B, and Table 4 of the application as originally filed. Dependent claims 2 and 4 have been amended to remove elements that are added to amended claim 23, in which claims 2 and 4 depend from. Similarly, dependent claims 33 and 35 have been amended to remove elements that are added to amended claim 29, in which claims 33 and 35 depend from. No new matter is introduced.

10

Regarding 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 2-4, 23-35, 38, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bent et al (US 6,901,441) in view of Lehman et al (US 5,974,420) in further view of Johanson et al ("Tuplespaces as Coordination Infrastructure for Interactive Workspaces"). Claims 11, 12, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bent et al (US 6,901,441) in view of Lehman et al (US 5,974,420) in further view of Johanson et al ("Tuplespaces as Coordination Infrastructure for Interactive Workspaces") in further view of Office Notice.

20

With respect to independent claims 23 and 29, Applicant traverses this rejection on the grounds that not all elements are taught by the cited combination of references of Bent, Lehman, and Johanson. It is noted that independent claims 23 and 29 are directed to a

system and a method, respectively, for exchanging events, wherein each event has a set of unordered named fields, wherein each of the unordered named fields includes *a post value and a template value*, and wherein said set of unordered named fields of each of said events includes *a standard source field and a corresponding target field*. The source and target fields are for routing events between clients. In contrast, the cited text of Bent and the system of Lehman are directed to TupleSpaces where routing between clients is not desirable. In other words, the systems of Bent and Lehman are focused on distributed computing where address routing (i.e. using source and target fields) is generally not used. Though the cited text of Bent (col. 5, lines 1-33) discusses that each of the fields of a tuple has an optional “name”, this “name” refers to the name of the field and is not necessarily associated with the source or target clients for routing purposes. Applicant submits that having both *a standard source field and a corresponding target field*, as required by claims 23 and 29, is not taught or suggested by the cited text of Bent and is generally not appreciated or implemented by TupleSpace systems. In addition, Johanson fails to mention routing between clients using source and target fields.

It is also important to note that claims 23 and 29 require *post and template* values for each field. In contrast, the fields for the tuples of Bent and Lehman are used for posting an event *or* receiving tuples only. In other words, each field of a tuple of Bent and Lehman contains a *single* value used *either* for broadcasting the tuple *or* for requesting a tuple. Having a post *and* a template value for each field enables functionalities not possible when the field has only one of a post value or a template value. For example, having both post and template values for each field allows for events to be duplicated and used as templates for further action. With both post and template values, events can be used to

compare updates and changes between multiple received events. This functionality is not possible in existing tuplespaces, e.g. the system described in Lehman.

For at least these reasons, Applicant holds claims 23 and 29 allowable over the cited references as the cited references do not include all elements of claims 23 and 29. Claims 2-4, 11-12, and 24-28 depend from claim 23, so the above arguments in connection with claim 1 are also responsive to the rejections of claims 2-4, 11-12, and 24-28. Similarly, Claims 30-39 depend from claim 29, so the above arguments in connection with claim 29 are also responsive to the rejections of claims 30-39. Accordingly, Applicant holds that claims 2-4, 11-12, and 23-39 are allowable over the cited references.

In addition to the above arguments in connection with claims 23 and 29, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2, 4, 33 and 35 are allowable over the cited references. In particular, with regards to claims 2 and 35, the cited references do not teach the further feature wherein the target fields are set to wildcards by default for the posted events, and wherein the standard source fields are set to wildcards by default for the template events for retrieval.

With regards to claims 4 and 35, claims 4 and 35 require the further features of formal and virtual field values. The cited references fail to teach or suggest formal *and virtual* field values. Formal and virtual field values allow for flexible event matching as described in the application as originally filed, e.g. page 40, lines 12-19 and Table 6. Though Lehman teaches formal fields for wildcard matching of the field values, Lehman fails to teach or suggest anything to do with virtual fields. In fact, Lehman requires that a “template

matches a tuple if they have an *equal* number of fields and each template field matches the corresponding tuple field” (col. 1, lines 33-35 of Lehman – bold and italics added). Lehman’s matching requirement of having an *equal* number of fields for the template and the tuple teaches away from the virtual fields as required by claims 4 and 35. Virtual fields
5 are ignored in the matching as described in claims 4 and 35, therefore the matching in claims 4 and 35 inherently do not require an equal number of fields.

For at least these reasons, Applicant holds claims 2, 4, 33, and 35 allowable over the cited references.

10

CONCLUSION

The Applicant hereby submits a bona fide attempt to address the rejections in the Office Action and argues why the present claims are different from the art of record. The
5 Examiner is sincerely invited to telephone the undersigned at 650-424-0100 for clarification or any suggested actions such as an Examiner's Amendment to accelerate prosecution and forward the present application to allowance. Allowance of the claims now in the application is kindly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Trieu T. Mai /

Trieu T. Mai
Reg. No. 61,354
Lumen Patent Firm, Inc.
2345 Yale Street, Second Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306
650-424-0100 (phone)

10